



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

ml  
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/592,596	06/12/2000	Richard Humpleman	SAM1.0067	7063
23386	7590	06/01/2007	EXAMINER	
MYERS DAWES ANDRAS & SHERMAN, LLP			TRAN, MYLINH T	
19900 MACARTHUR BLVD.,			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SUITE 1150			2179	
IRVINE, CA 92612				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
06/01/2007		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	09/592,596	HUMPLEMAN ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	Mylinh Tran	2179

*-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --*

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 March 2007.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**.                                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### **DETAILED ACTION**

Applicant's request for reconsideration filed 03/05/07 has been entered and carefully considered. However, arguments regarding rejections under 35.U.S.C 103 to claims 1-27 have not been found to be persuasive. Therefore, these claims have not been found to be patentable over the prior art of record; therefore, claims 1-27 are rejected under the same ground of rejection as set forth in the Office Action mailed (11/02/06).

### **Terminal Disclaimer**

The examiner notes Applicant's submission of Terminal Disclaimer filed 06/10/2005 to overcome provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection. However, the examiner maintains the current double patenting rejection at the present time, pending an official decision by the Office Paralegal regarding acceptance of said disclaimer.

### ***Double Patenting***

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees.

See *In re Goodman*, 91 F.3d .1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ

619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thonngton*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321 (c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 16, 17, 19, 20, 21, 23, 24, 26 and 27 provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 6, and 11-13 of copending Application No. 09/592598 in view of Saito et al ("Saito", US 6,523,696).

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

As per claim 1, 11 and 21, claim 1 of 09/592598 claims the same subject matter as claims 1, 11 and 21 of 09/592596 except that first devices, capable of displaying a user interface, are connected to a first network and second devices are connected to a second network. Claim 1 of 09/592598 only discloses all the devices are connected to one single network. However, Saito teaches obtaining

information from said first devices currently connected to the first network (1"and 2" *d Home Network* 203 of fig. 7), and obtaining information from the interface device (PC 210 of fig. 7) about the second devices connected to the second network (*Home Automation Network* 212 of fig. 7; col. 21, lines 50-60). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the teaching from Saito of having first display capable devices and second devices connected to the first and second network, respectively, in claim 1 of 09/592598 since it would have allowed devices to be controlled over different networks.

As per claims 6, 16 and 23, claim 6 of 09/592598 claims the same subject matter as claims 6, 16 and 23 of 09/592596.

As per claims 7, 1,7 and 24, claim 12 of 09/592598 claims the same subject matter as claims 7, 17 and 24 of 09/592596.

As per claims 9, 19 and 26, claim 11 of 09/592598 claims the same subject matter as claims 9, 19 and 26 of 09/592596.

As per claims 10, 20 and 27, claim 13 of 09/592598 claims the same subject matter as claims 10, 20 and 27 of 09/592596.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saito et al. [US 6, 523, 696] in view of Yang [US. 6,133,847].

**As per independent claim 1**, Saito teaches a computer implemented method and corresponding system for providing user interfaces in a first network including first devices interconnected via a communication medium and at least one interface device connecting said first network to at least a second network having interconnected second devices, the user interfaces for controlling the devices that are currently connected to the first network and devices that are currently connected to the second network, comprising the steps/means: obtaining information from said first devices currently connected to the first network (1" and 2"d *Home Network* 203 of fig. 7), said information including graphical and/or textual information (col. 21, lines 5-10); obtaining information from the interface device (PC 210 of fig. 7) about the second devices connected to the second network, said information including graphical and/or textual information; and (*Home Automation Network* 212 of fig. 7; col. 21, lines 50-60); Saito fails to clearly teach the step of generating the user interface and displaying a control user interface.

However, Yang teaches generating a user interface description in one or more of said first devices based at least on the obtained information, the user interface description in each first device including: at least one graphical and/or textual reference of said first devices that are currently connected to the first network, and at least one graphical and/or textual reference of said second devices that are currently connected to the second network (column 4, lines 15-38); and displaying a top level user interface based on the user interface description on a device connected to the first network capable of displaying user interfaces (column 4, lines 30-58); displaying a control user interface on a device connected to the first network capable of displaying user interfaces (column 5, lines 32-46) for user control one or more of said first and second devices by: using a reference in a user interface description, the reference corresponding to a first device or a second device, to perform the steps of: using said reference to access the associated information stored in said corresponding device; generating the control user interface including device data corresponding to said corresponding device using the accessed information stored in said corresponding device; and displaying the control user interface for user control of said corresponding device (column 5, line 33 through column 6, line 58).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to combine Yang's teaching with the system of Saito.

Motivation of the combination would have to be available controls for user selected.

**As per claim 2**, which is dependent on claim 1, Yang teaches said interface device includes information about the second devices (column 4, lines 15-38). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to combine Yang's teaching with the system of Saito.

Motivation of the combination would have to be available controls for user selected.

**As per claim 3**, which is dependent on claim 1, Saito teaches the first network comprises a 1394 bus (1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> *Home Network* of fig. 7), and the second network comprises a non-1394 bus (*Home Automation Network* of fig. 7).

**As per claim 4**, which is dependent on claim 3, Saito teaches the interface device includes an address extension table for the second devices, and wherein step of obtaining information from the interface device further includes the steps of using the address extension table to access said second devices (col. 24, lines 41-67 through col. 25, lines 1-3).

**As per claim 5**, which is dependent on claim 1, it is inherent in Saito's system that the PC device 210 (fig. 178) would include a bridge device acted as an interface between the 2<sup>nd</sup> Home Network and Home Automation Network.

**As per claim 6**, which is dependent on claim 1, Yang teaches displaying one or more top level user interfaces each based on a user interface description, on one or more devices connected to the first network capable of displaying a user

interface, for user control of said first and second devices (column 6, lines 7-47). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to combine Yang's teaching with the system of Saito. Motivation of the combination would have to be available controls for user selected.

**As per claim 7**, which is dependent on claim 6, Yang teaches the step of displaying each user interface further includes the steps of: using each reference in the corresponding user interface description to access the associated information in each device; generating the top level user interface including device data corresponding to each device using the accessed information in each device; and displaying the top level user interface on said device capable of displaying a user interface (column 6, lines 7-47). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to combine Yang's teaching with the system of Saito. Motivation of the combination would have to be available controls for user selected.

**As per claim 8**, which is dependent on claim 1, Yang teaches the step of generating a user interface description further comprises the steps of: associating a hyper-text link with the device information of one or more of said first and second devices (column 4, lines 15-55). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to combine Yang's teaching with the system of Saito.

Motivation of the combination would have to be available controls for user selected.

**As per claims 9 and 10**, which are dependent on claims 1 and 9 respectively, Yang teaches the information in each device includes a user control interface description for user interaction with the device and the step of generating a user interface description further includes the steps of generating each user interface description such that each reference in that user interface description is to at least the user control interface description in each corresponding device (column 4, lines 15-65). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to combine Yang's teaching with the system of Saito. Motivation of the combination would have to be available controls for user selected.

**As per independent claims 11 and 21**, they are similar in scope to claim 1; therefore, they should be rejected under similar rationale.

**As per claim 12**, which is dependent on claim 11, it is a similar scope to claim 2; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

**As per claims 13 and 22**, which are dependent on claims 11 and 21 respectively, they are similar in scope to claim 3; therefore, they should be rejected under similar rationale.

**As per claim 14**, which is dependent on claim 13, it is a similar scope to claim 4; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

**As per claim 15**, which is dependent on claim 11, it is a similar scope to claim 5; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

**As per claims 16 and 23**, which are dependent on claims 11 and 21 respectively, they are similar in scope to claim 6; therefore, they should be rejected under similar rationale.

**As per claims 17 and 24**, which are dependent on claims 16 and 23 respectively, they are similar in scope to claim 7; therefore, they should be rejected under similar rationale.

**As per claims 18 and 25**, which are dependent on claims 11 and 21, they are similar in scope to claim 8; therefore, they should be rejected under similar rationale.

**As per claims 19 and 26**, which are dependent on claims 11 and 21 respectively, they are similar in scope to claim 9; therefore, they should be rejected under similar rationale.

**As per claims 20 and 27**, which are dependent on claims 19 and 26 respectively, they are similar in scope to claim 10; therefore, they should be rejected under similar rationale.

#### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant has argued that Saito does not disclose “obtaining information from the interface device about the second devices connected to the second network, said information including graphical and/or textual information”.

However, Saito further teaches about graphical and textual information stored

as information in ROM in column 22, line 66 to column 12, line 23, in which Saito teaches the process of recognizing terminals or services by reading the configuration ROM on the 1394 bus and displaying the graphical icons and associated texts on the display screen as in figures 13 and 14. Figures 13-14 show "DVD Player", "Video", "WWW", "Air. Conditioner", "Printer" are graphical information of the first and second networks.

Applicant also argued that Saito does not teach generating a user interface description in one or more of said first devices based at least on the obtained information, the user interface description in each first device including: at least one graphical and/or textual reference of said first devices that are currently connected to the first network, and at least one graphical and/or textual reference of said second devices that are currently connected to the second network and displaying a top level user interface based on the user interface description on a device connected to the first network capable of displaying user interfaces. However, the examiner relied on Yang for these features.

First, the examiner agrees on this point that in Yang, the remote 100 accesses the memory 120 in the remote 100 itself, not the appliances. However, in the applicant's system still needs a memory or a cache to store the information of the devices. In order to access the device and device information in the device to generate a control interface for user interaction, the applicant's system must have a storage device such as a memory or a cache to store the device information. Similar to the applicant's system, Yang's system teaches a remote

control memory to store the information which is disclosed at column 8, lines 19-24 "the selection of the icon would provide a control signal to the functions interface and the functions interface would then access the control software for that appliance from memory and configure the user interface function control panel so that it would be configured to control the appliance selected." In the applicant's system, the user interface must have a cache to store information of each device in order to generate references associated with the device information in the device. Therefore, a user will not be able to direct access to the selected device without passing a storage device. In the applicant's system, in order to fulfill the step of generating the user interface including the references based on the obtained information, the system has to store the obtained information in somewhere in order to generate the user interface and references based on the obtained information. Without the storage device such as a cache or a memory, the system could not be able to generate the user interface based on the obtain information of the appliances. Therefore, similar to the applicant's system, in Yang's system, the obtained information is stored in the remote control memory to generate the icons that are references. Second, the Yang's system in concept is not different from the claimed invention nor the result has any differences at all. From the technical point of view, the appliances can be controlled by the user interface from in the appliance or by a remote controller which achieved the same results and the same concept.

The applicant's system discloses the user selecting a reference in the user interface, the remote control 100 accessed the corresponding appliance and accesses the corresponding control program from that appliance to generate a control interface. It is not clear to the examiner the task of the user interface in the applicant's system. The user interface is generated based on the appliance information. It is more reasonable that the information is stored in the user interface for the user got that information when needed. However, when the user wants to control a device, the user selects a reference and the remote control 100 accessed the corresponding appliance and accesses the corresponding control program from that appliance. To the examiner, the user interface has not task between the user and the appliances.

The Applicant does not specify the invention in the claimed language. The applicant does not recite the system generates a control user interface from the appliances without accessing the memory of the remote control.

The claimed language itself is a broad term. It is not clearly enough to describe the original specification.

During patent examination, the pending claims must be "given >their< broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification." > *In re Hyatt*, 211 F.3d 1367, 1372, 54 USPQ2d 1664, 1667 (Fed. Cir. 2000). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Applicant always has the opportunity to amend the claims during prosecution, and broad interpretation by the examiner reduces the possibility that the claim, once issued, will be interpreted more broadly than is justified. *In re Prater*, 415 F.2d 1393, 1404-05, 162 USPQ 541, 550-51 (CCPA 19

The system does obtain information from one or more devices currently connected to the network according to Yang's teaching at column 8, lines 10 to 14, in which "the remote control device could receive an interface control signal from each of the appliances on the network or in the room". And based on the obtained information, the system generates a top page user interface description including a separate icon for each appliance that is available to be controlled (col. 8, lines 14-17).

The system does obtain information from one or more devices currently connected to the network according to Yang's teaching at column 8, lines 10 to 14, in which "the remote control device could receive an interface control signal from each of the appliances on the network or in the room". And based on the obtained information, the system generates a user interface description including a separate icon for each appliance that is available to be controlled (col. 8, lines 14-17). The user interface (140) of the hand-held device (100) is a function control panel providing information to the user related to utilizing the remote control device to control a particular appliance (or multiple devices). The hand-held device provides icons to be displayed on the user interface, and each icon represents one single device. The selection of the icon would provide a

control signal to the functions interface and the functions interface would then access the control software for that appliance from memory and configure the user interface function control panel so that it would be configured to control the applicant selected. Therefore, Yang discloses "the user interface including at least one reference associated with the device information in each of said devices currently connected to the network". Yang discloses references (icons) to access the control software for that appliance from memory. Yang still teaches the function interface accesses the control software of each appliance event through its memory. It is clearly that in Yang, the remote 100 accesses the remote to control the appliance.

According to Yang, the remote control, that uses to control the controlled devices currently connected to the network, does not contain the user control interface description of each corresponding controlled device. The user control interface description of each corresponding controlled device, that allows user interaction with that device, is contained within the corresponding controlled device and is download to the remote control device and stores in the memory (e.g., col. 4, lines 32-38). The top page user interface description (as explained in item (a) above) does include at least one electronic link (the user would ***select the icon that represents the particular appliance***; col. 8, lines 18-19) providing direct access from the top page user interface description to at least the user control interface description contained in each corresponding device, which has been downloaded to the memory of the remote control (***the***

***selection of the icon*** would provide a control signal to the function interface and the functions interface would ***then access the control software for that appliance from memory so that it would be configured to control the appliance selected***; col. 8, lines 19-24). It is also further notice that selection on the icon, represents the particular appliance, that leads to accessing the control software for that appliance from memory is, in fact, “electronic link”. Yang does teach when a link in the top page user interface description is user activated (e.g., the user would ***select the icon that represents the particular appliance***; col. 8, lines 18-19), the control interface description in the corresponding device is accessed using the activated link to obtain device information and generate a device user interface for user interaction with that corresponding device (***the selection of the icon*** would provide a control signal to the function interface and the functions interface would ***then access the control software for that appliance from memory so that it would be configured to control the appliance selected***; col. 8, lines 19-24).

Yang does teach Yang links for direct access to control programs in appliances as explained in (b) and (c) above. Since using HTML technology to implement top page graphical user interface, that includes top level icons representing controlled appliances, and applying HTML link to link a selected device icon to another HTML page to display further functional control panel for controlling that particular device would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art. Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of

the invention to include hyper-text link HTML pages define sets of user interface functions for multiple devices, connected to a network, that enable user interaction and control of those devices in Yang's method since hyper-text link HTML pages would allow the devices to be remotely controlled from the Internet via HTTP protocol.

### **Conclusion**

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mylinh Tran. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Thu from 7:00AM to 3:00PM at 571-272-4141.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor; Weilun Lo, can be reached at 571-272-4847.

The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are as follows:

571-273-8300

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either **Private PAIR or Public PAIR**. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Mylinh Tran

AU: 2179



WEILUN LO

**SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**